REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1 has been revised. Claim 1 is supported by, for example, Fig. 2 and pages 4-5 in the Specification. Page 5, lines 19-29 in the Specification states a process and the resulting structure, wherein the film forming layer (first fluororesin material) and the particle region (second fluororesin material) are both melted in a mixed state. Fig. 2 shows the fluororesin coating layer having no distinguishable boundary between the first fluororesin material and the second fluororesin material. Claims 2, 4, and 11 have been revised to track with claim 1. Claim 19 is new and supported by, for example, page 4, lines 5-20 in the Specification. Claim 20 is new and supported by, for example, page 5, lines 30-35. There is no new matter. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 11 are pending.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner Jonathan M. Foreman for the telephonic interview held on February 16, 2011 with Applicant's representatives Douglas P. Mueller (Reg. No. 30,300) and Alexander J. Kim. At the interview, a proposed claim language was discussed. The "jello mold" structure provided as an analogy on pages 6-7 of the Office Action was also discussed at the interview. No agreement was reached at the conclusion of the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas et al. (US 6291054) in view of Anderson et al. (US 2002/0082524) and Mori et al. (US 2002/0172829). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Regarding claim 1, the rejection stated that Thomas et al. teaches a metal surface having a fluororesin coating layer and particulate matter "baked as a single unit" (page 2 of the Office Action). The rejection has identified the ceramic particles in Thomas et al. as a particulate matter (see page 2 of the Office Action). Thomas et al. specifically teaches that the ceramic particles are structurally separate from the coating layer (see Fig. 1). Thus, even if Thomas et al., Anderson et al., and Mori et al. could be combined, which Applicants are not conceding that they are combinable, the combination of Thomas et al., Anderson et al., and Mori et al. results in an immiscible morphology of the coating layer material and the particulate matter, having

structurally distinguishable boundary between the coating layer material and the particulate matter (see the "jello mold" structure analogy provided on pages 6-7 of the Office Action).

In contrast, claim 1 is directed towards a fluororesin coated medical guide wire, comprising a metal wire; and a fluororesin coating layer covering at least a portion of a surface of the metal wire, the fluororesin coating layer including a base layer made of a first fluororesin material, and surface protrusion-shaped smooth projections of a second fluororesin material, wherein the first and the second fluororesin materials are compatibly melted together, the fluororesin coating layer having no clearly distinguishable boundary between the first fluororesin material and the second fluororesin material. Applicants respectfully submit that the structural morphology recited in claim 1 cannot be achieved by the combination of Thomas et al., Anderson et al., and Mori et al.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Thomas et al. in view of Anderson et al. and further in view of Mori et al. Claims 2, 4-8, 11 and 19 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 from which they depend. Applicants respectfully request a favorable reconsideration of the claims.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612) 455-3804.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

Dated: March 14, 2011

By: _____
Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/ajk